

REMARKS

Summary of the Office Action

Claims 25 and 27-29 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Nishiki et al. (US 5,946,060).

Claim 26 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Nishiki et al. in view of Kim (US 5,338,240).

Claims 30-39 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Nishiki et al. in view of Applicant's Disclosed Related Art and Kim.

Applicant wishes to thank the Examiner for the indication that claims 1-24 are allowable.

Summary of the Response to the Office Action

Applicant has amended claims 25, 30, and 36 to further define the invention.

Accordingly, claims 1-39 are pending for consideration.

Claims Define Allowable Subject Matter

Claims 25 and 27-29 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Nishiki et al. (US 5,946,060), claim 26 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Nishiki et al. in view of Kim (US 5,338,240), and claims 30-39 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Nishiki et al. in view of Applicant's Disclosed Related Art and Kim. Applicant respectfully traverses these rejections as being based upon a combination of references that neither teaches nor suggests the novel combination of features recited in amended independent claims 25, 30, and 36, and hence dependent claims 26-29, 31-35, and 37-39.

Independent claim 25, as amended, recites a liquid crystal display panel including a plurality of side and pixel electrodes, wherein “side portions of the side electrodes are coplanar with side portions of the pixel electrodes along a surface of the insulating layer.” Similarly, independent claim 30, as amended, recites a liquid crystal display panel including a plurality of side and pixel electrodes, wherein “side portions of the side electrodes are coplanar with side portions of the pixel electrodes along a surface of the second insulating layer.” Likewise, independent claim 36, as amended, recites a method for fabricating a liquid crystal display panel including steps of forming a plurality of side and pixel electrodes, wherein “side portions of the side electrodes are coplanar with side portions of the pixel electrodes along a surface of the passivation layer.”

In contrast to Applicant’s claimed invention, and as admitted by the Office Action, Nishiki et al. “fails to teach these side electrodes having side portions coplanar with the pixel electrodes as they are formed on an insulating layer above the pixel electrode.” Moreover, as further admitted by the Office Action, Kim “teaches side electrodes that overlap the data lines however the width of these electrodes is explicitly less than that of the data lines.” Accordingly, Applicant respectfully assert that independent claims 25, 30, and 36, as amended to recite the allowable features of independent claims 1, 10, and 19, are now allowable over Nishiki et al. and Kim. Thus, Applicant respectfully requests that the rejections of claims 25-39 be withdrawn, and that a Notice of Allowance for claims 1-39 be issued.

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of this application and the timely allowance of the pending claims. Should the Examiner believe that there are any issues outstanding after consideration of this response, the Examiner is invited to contact Applicant's undersigned representative to expedite prosecution.

If there is any fee due in connection with the filing of this Amendment, please charge the fees to our Deposit Account No. 50-0310. If a fee is required for an extension of time under 37 C.F.R. § 1.136 not accounted for above, such an extension is requested and the fee should also be charged to our Deposit Account.

Respectfully submitted,

MORGAN, LEWIS & BOCKIUS LLP

By: _____



David B. Hardy
Reg. No. 47,362

Dated: September 25, 2006

Customer No. 009629
MORGAN, LEWIS & BOCKIUS LLP
1111 Pennsylvania Avenue, N.W.
Washington, DC 20004
202-739-3000